FINAL
DECISION DOCUMENT FOR THE
FORMER SECURITY OPERATIONAL TEST SITE, PARCEL 102(7)
FORT McCLELLAN, CALHOUN COUNTY, ALABAMA

ISSUED BY: THE U. S. ARMY

NOVEMBER 2002

U.S. ARMY ANNOUNCES DECISION DOCUMENT

This Decision Document presents the determination that no further remedial action, with regard to hazardous substances, will be necessary to protect human health and the environment at the Former Security Operational Test Site, Parcel 102(7), at Fort McClellan (FTMC) in Calhoun County, Alabama. In addition, this Decision Document provides the site background information used as the basis for the no further action decision with regard to hazardous substances. The location of the parcel at FTMC is shown on Figure 1.

This Decision Document is issued by the U.S. Army Garrison at FTMC with involvement by the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Cleanup Team (BCT). The BCT consists of representatives from the U.S. Army, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 4, and the Alabama Department of Environmental Management. The BCT is responsible for planning and implementing environmental investigations at FTMC.

Based on the results of the site investigation (SI) completed at the Former Security Operational Test Site, Parcel 102(7), the U.S. Army will implement no further action at the site with regard to hazardous substances. This decision was made by the U.S. Army with concurrence by the BCT.

This Decision Document summarizes site information presented in detail in background documents that are part of the administrative record for the Former Security Operational Test Site, Parcel 102(7). The background documents for Parcel 102(7) are listed on Page 2 and are available at the public repositories listed on Page 3.

REGULATIONS GOVERNING SITE

FTMC is undergoing closure by the BRAC Commission under Public Laws 100-526 and 101-510. The 1990 Base Closure Act, Public Law 101-510, established the process by which U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) installations would be closed or realigned. The BRAC Environmental Restoration Program requires investigation and cleanup of federal properties prior to transfer to the public domain. In addition, the Community Environmental Response Facilitation Act (CERFA) (Public Law 102-426) requires federal agencies to identify real property on military installations scheduled for closure that can be transferred to the public for redevelopment or reuse. Consequently, the U.S. Army is conducting environmental studies of the impact of suspected contaminants at parcels at FTMC. The BRAC Environmental Restoration Program at FTMC follows the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) process.

SITE BACKGROUND

FTMC is located in the foothills of the Appalachian Mountains of northeastern Alabama near the cities of Anniston and Weaver in Calhoun County. FTMC consists of two main areas of government-owned properties: the Main Post and Pelham Range. Until May 1998, the FTMC installation also included the Choccolocco Corridor, a 4,488-acre tract of land that was

PRIMARY BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS FOR PARCEL 102(7)

Environmental Science and Engineering, Inc. (ESE), 1998, ***Final Environmental Baseline Survey, Fort McClellan, Alabama***, prepared for U.S. Army Environmental Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, January.

IT Corporation (IT), 2002, ***Final Site Investigation Report, Former Security Operational Test Site, Parcel 102(7), Fort McClellan, Calhoun County, Alabama***, May.

IT Corporation (IT), 2000, ***Final Human Health and Ecological Screening Values and PAH Background Summary Report, Fort McClellan, Calhoun County, Alabama***, July.

Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC), 1998, ***Final Background Metals Survey Report, Fort McClellan, Alabama,*** July.

leased from the State of Alabama. The Main Post, which occupies 18,929 acres, is bounded on the east by the Choccolocco Corridor, which previously connected the Main Post with the Talladega National Forest. Pelham Range, which occupies 22,245 acres, is located approximately 5 miles due west of the Main Post and adjoins the Anniston Army Depot on the southwest.

The Former Security Operational Test Site, Parcel 102(7), is located in the central portion of Pelham Range (Figure 1). The Former Security Operational Test Site, which covers approximately 7.3 acres, consists of two separate facilities: an administration center and a building test site (Parcel 102). The building test site was constructed to replicate a nuclear weapons storage facility for the purpose of testing and evaluating various security systems. Tests sometimes involved the use of high explosives. Data collected by sensors at the building test site were transmitted to the administration center, where they were recorded for later analysis. Testing reportedly began at the Former Security Operational Test Site in 1982 and ended in 1994 (Environmental Science and Engineering, Inc. [ESE], 1998).

Presently, the building test site consists of a guard building, maintenance and assembly building, two ammunition bunkers (igloos), and one igloo headwall. The maintenance and assembly building provided general storage, workshop, electrical/electronics room, and latrine facilities and was also used to billet troops. Certain explosive devices were assembled in the workshop using C-4 explosive. The test site was equipped with a fire pond to provide water for fire fighting at a weapons storage site. According to interviews conducted during the environmental baseline survey (EBS), fire fighting was not conducted at this facility. Troops reportedly discarded materials in the fire pond following training exercises. However, the nature of any materials discarded in the fire pond was not disclosed (ESE, 1998).

Materials used during the tests included torches, carry cable (aluminum cable with a plastic coating to convey oxygen gas), various ceramic and steel saws, high explosives, various types of armor plating, survivable overpack containers, methyl ethyl ketone, sticky foam, proprietary organic solvent, and Thermolag (a proprietary substance to protect contents from torches). Explosives were used during many of the security tests, including copper-clad charges and lead-clad charges. Explosives were used at both igloos and at the headwall. Titanium oxide smoke was used at Igloo No. 2. Caustic chemicals were used to make the smoke. Two smoke generators were also installed in Igloo No. 2. Small-arms ammunition was rarely authorized and was generally restricted to blank ammunition (ESE, 1998).

PUBLIC INFORMATION REPOSITORIES
FOR FORT McCLELLAN

Anniston Calhoun County Public Library
Reference Section
Anniston, Alabama 36201
Point of Contact: Ms. Sunny Addison
Telephone: (256) 237-8501
Fax: (256) 238-0474
Hours of Operation: Monday – Friday 9:00 a.m. - 6:30 p.m.
Saturday 9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.
Sunday 1:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Houston Cole Library
9th Floor
Jacksonville State University
700 Pelham Road
Jacksonville, Alabama 36265
Point of Contact: Ms. Rita Smith (256) 782-5249
Hours of Operation: Monday – Thursday 7:30 a.m. – 11:00 p.m.
Friday 7:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.
Saturday 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Sunday 3:00 p.m. – 11:00 p.m.

An aboveground storage tank located west of the guard building was used to service diesel generators at the test site. Underground storage tanks were not present at the test site. Temporary structures were present at the western end of the loop road, but the function of these temporary structures is unknown (ESE, 1998).

Testing was conducted on a material called "sticky foam," which was developed for the purpose of immobilizing intruders. A proprietary organic solvent was used to render the sticky foam inoperative. One field test was conducted in late 1988 behind the headwall. Solvent was not detected on wipe samples or in soil samples collected following the cleanup of the 1988 test. Developmental testing of the sticky foam was conducted in 1991 in front of Igloo No. 1. A second field test was conducted in 1994 on concrete and grass at the headwall. The FTMC Directorate of Environment Office regulated testing conducted in 1994. The sticky foam was tested for hazardous characteristics; however, the foam was determined to be nonhazardous (ESE, 1998).

The facility closed after 1994. During facility closure, doors were removed and cleaned. Manifold tanks, chain-link cages, and angle iron frames covered with dried sticky foam were dismantled and disposed (ESE, 1998).

SCOPE AND ROLE OF PARCEL

Information developed from the EBS was used to group areas at FTMC into standardized parcel categories using DOD guidance (ESE, 1998). All parcels received a parcel designation for one of seven CERFA categories, or a non-CERCLA qualifier designation, as appropriate. Parcel 102(7) was categorized as CERFA Category 7 parcel in the EBS. This CERFA category identifies areas that are not evaluated or require additional evaluation. The Former Security

Operational Test Site required additional evaluation to determine the environmental condition of the parcel (ESE, 1998).

With the issuance of this Decision Document, Parcel 102(7) is re-categorized as a CERFA Category 3 parcel. Category 3 parcels are areas where release, disposal, and/or migration of hazardous substances has occurred but at concentrations that do not require a removal or remedial response.

SITE INVESTIGATION

An SI was conducted by IT Corporation (IT) at the Former Security Operational Test Site, Parcel 102(7), to determine whether chemical constituents are present at the site at concentrations that present an unacceptable risk to human health or the environment (IT, 2002). Environmental sampling conducted during the SI consisted of the sampling and analysis of three surface soil samples, three subsurface soil samples, one surface water sample, and one sediment sample. In addition, three permanent groundwater monitoring wells were installed at the site. However, the wells did not produce sufficient water for sampling.

Chemical analysis of samples collected at the Former Security Operational Test Site indicated that metals, volatile organic compounds (VOC), and semivolatile organic compounds (SVOC) were detected in the environmental media sampled. To evaluate whether the detected constituents pose an unacceptable risk to human health or the environment, the analytical results were compared to human health site-specific screening levels (SSSL), ecological screening values (ESV), and background screening values for FTMC (IT, 2000). In addition, a preliminary risk assessment (PRA) was performed to further characterize the potential threat to human health (IT, 2002).

The potential threat to human receptors is expected to be minimal. Although the site is projected for continued military training use by the Alabama Army National Guard, the SI analytical data were screened against residential human health SSSLs to evaluate the site for possible unrestricted land reuse. Metals were the only constituents detected above SSSLs in site media. Antimony, arsenic, and chromium exceeded their respective SSSLs and upper background ranges in soils, and thallium exceeded its SSSL and upper background range in surface water. The PRA identified arsenic as the only chemical of concern for residential exposure at Parcel 102(7). The PRA concluded, however, that arsenic does not pose an unacceptable human health threat in the residential reuse scenario (IT, 2002).

The potential threat to ecological receptors is expected to be very low. Concentrations of metals and one VOC (trichlorofluoro-methane) exceeded their respective ESVs. Trichlorofluoromethane was detected in the sediment sample collected at the site. In soils collected at the site, three metals (arsenic, antimony, and lead) exceeded their respective ESVs and upper background ranges. In surface water, thallium was detected at a concentration exceeding its ESV and the upper background range. However, the site does not readily support substantial ecological receptors. Because the relatively small site is fenced and occupied by buildings and pavement, the threat to ecological receptors is expected to be minimal.

SITE REMEDIAL ACTIONS

Remedial actions were not conducted at the Former Security Operational Test Site, Parcel 102(7).

DESCRIPTION OF NO FURTHER ACTION

Remedial alternatives were not developed for Parcel 102(7). No further action is selected because remedial action is unnecessary to protect human health or the environment at this site. The metals and chemical compounds detected in site media do not pose an unacceptable risk to human health or the environment. Therefore, the site is released for unrestricted land reuse with regard to hazardous substances. Furthermore, Parcel 102(7) is re-categorized as a CERFA Category 3 parcel. Category 3 parcels are areas where release, disposal, and/or migration of hazardous substances has occurred but at concentrations that do not require a removal or remedial response. With regard to hazardous substances, the U.S. Army will

not take any further action to investigate, remediate, or monitor the Former Security Operational Test Site, Parcel 102(3), (formerly Parcel 102[7]).

The following costs are associated with implementing the no-action alternative:

Capital Cost:	$0
Annual Operation & Maintenance Costs:	$0
Present Worth Cost:	$0
Months to Implement:	None
Remedial Duration:	None.

DECLARATION

Remedial action with regard to hazardous substances is unnecessary at the Former Security Operational Test Site, Parcel 102(7). The no further action remedy with regard to hazardous substances protects human health and the environment, complies with relevant federal and state regulations, and is a cost-effective application of public funds. This remedy will not leave in place hazardous substances at concentrations that require limiting the future use of the parcel, or that require land use control restrictions. The site is released for unrestricted land reuse with regard to hazardous substances.

Parcel 102(7) is re-categorized as a CERFA Category 3 parcel. Category 3 parcels are areas where release, disposal, and/or migration of hazardous substances has occurred but at concentrations that do not require a removal or remedial response. There will not be any further remedial costs associated with implementing no further action with regard to hazardous substances at the Former Security Operational Test Site, Parcel 102(3) (formerly Parcel 102[7]).

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Any questions or comments concerning this Decision Document or other documents in the administrative record can be directed to:

Mr. Ronald M. Levy
Fort McClellan BRAC
Environmental Coordinator
Tel: (256) 848-3539
E-mail: LevyR@mcclellan-emh2.army.mil

ACRONYMS

BCT	BRAC Cleanup Team
BRAC	Base Realignment and Closure
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CERFA	Community Environmental Response Facilitation Act
DOD	U.S. Department of Defense
EBS	environmental baseline survey
ESE	Environmental Science and Engineering, Inc.
ESV	ecological screening value
FTMC	Fort McClellan
IT	IT Corporation
PRA	preliminary risk assessment
SI	site investigation
SSSL	site-specific screening level
SVOC	semivolatile organic compound
VOC	volatile organic compound

Prepared under direction of:

Lee D. Coker
Environmental Engineer
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District
Mobile, Alabama

Date

Reviewed by:

Ronald M. Levy
BRAC Environmental Coordinator
Fort McClellan, Alabama

Date

Approved by:

Glynn D. Ryan
Site Manager
Fort McClellan, Alabama

Date